UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,812	05/28/2004	Karen Nadja Pineiro		3811
26387 W. NORMAN	7590 08/23/2007 ROTH		EXAMINER	
523 W. 6TH S	523 W. 6TH STREET		GRAHAM, MARK S	
SUITE 707 LOS ANGELE	S. CA 90014		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	-, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -		3711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Cummers	10/709,812	PINEIRO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Mark S. Graham	3711	•
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	3 ~~
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communications (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	•		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	action is non-final		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		ters, prosecution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 8-13, 15, 16</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) 7-9,14 and 17-20 is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	-		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		by the Evaminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		•	21(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	nriority under 35 H.S.C.	8 119(a) ₋ (d) or (f)	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 55 5.5.5.	3 1 10(a) (a) 01 (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			e
application from the International Bureau	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	` , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.	
•	•		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	•
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date	
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/709,812

Art Unit: 3711

Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 16 is identical to claim 15.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bureau.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bureau in view of Kloos et al. (Kloos) and Cirone. Bureau discloses the claimed device with the exception of the stretchable fabric. However, as disclosed by Kloos and Cirone it is known to provide such covers for sporting implements in stretchable fabric such that they completely conform to the sports implement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have done the same with Bureau's cover as well to allow it to more readily fit the hockey stick blade.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, note Bureau's inner layer 16 and outer layer 60. Bureau's inner layer may be made out of nylon for example which is considered adhesive resistant.

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bureau in view of Thompson.

Bureau discloses the claimed device with the exception of a ventilation means in one of the side panels. Bureau does indicate though that ventilation is a concern which is one reason why he provides notch 28. However, it is also known in the sports implement cover art to provide ventilation holes in the side panels as disclosed by Thompson. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have done the same with Bureau's device to aid in providing ventilation.

Claims 7-9, 14, and 17-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The other prior art cited on the PTO '892 form has been provided to show other articles which are similar to that claimed by applicant.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at telephone number 571-272-4410.

MSG 8/14/07 /Mark S. Graham/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711